



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,398	12/12/2001	Randy P. Stanley	ITL.0680US	8693

7590

09/08/2005

Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

DINH, KHANH Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/020,398

Applicant(s)

STANLEY, RANDY P.

Examiner

Khanh Dinh

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Reply filed on 6/23/2005. Claims 28-30 are further canceled. Therefore, claims 1-3 and 5-27 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 12-15, 18-21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Delaney et al. (Hereafter Delaney), U.S. pat. No.6,374,289.

As to claim 12, Delaney discloses a processor-based system comprising:

a processor (Peer Client 20 fig.1A) and a data storage medium (local memory or disk cache associated with the Peer Client) coupled to said processor and storing

instructions enabling said processor to set up an on-line meeting with a remote processor-based system (Peer Client 22 fig.1A) [Peer Client 20 connected to Peer Client 22 by an local network (14 fig.1A) using quires to determine if any peer client has a particular package sending quires to other peer clients to determine if any of them has a particular package and obtaining the desired data package if available, see fig.1A, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19].

receive data from the remote processor-based system related to information to be transmitted (if the Peer Client 22 has the desired data package, then peer client 20 obtain the data package from Peer Client 22, see fig.1B, col.5 lines 19-41) and determine whether the information is already stored in a local cache coupled to said first processor before completing a download of the information (if the neighboring client has the required package, the requesting client will download this data package rather than from the external server, see col.4 lines 38-61 and col.5 lines 19-41), and retrieve the locally cached information to display an image on said processor-based system during the on-line meeting if the information was locally cached [Peer Client obtaining the data package (cached data) from other Peer Client if the desired data package is available, see col.5 line 53 to col.6 line 43].

As to claim 13, Delaney discloses storing instructions enabling the processor to receive an image identifier [each data package (including documents, images, messages, data packages or other types of data, see col.1 lines 16-35) having a unique identifier MD5, see col.6 lines 12-43].

As to claim 14, Delaney discloses that the data storage medium further storing instructions enabling the processor to determine whether the image identifier identifies locally cached information (i.e., using hash tables containing information about data package, unique identifier and the location of the data package on the local network to determine if a client can then proceed to download the data package, see col.6 lines 13-65 and col.7 lines 10-39).

As to claim 15, Delaney discloses that the data storage medium further stores instructions enabling the processor to receive a portion of a downloaded image, the portion to enable identification of locally cached information (determining if client "A" had already downloaded a larger portion of the required data package than client "B", transferring the data package from client "A" is more optimal and indicating a fraction of the data package already downloaded, see col.9 lines 15-61 and col.10 lines 36-67).

As to claim 18, Delaney discloses the data storage medium further stores instructions enabling the processor (Client A) to download information from the remote processor-based system (Client B) if the information is not locally cached (Client A downloading data package from Client B if the data package was not found in the local storage medium of Client A, see col.7 lines 10-61).

As to claim 19, Delaney discloses the data storage medium further stores instructions

Art Unit: 2151

enabling the processor to cache the downloaded information (using Peer Client A for downloading the data package to the local storage, see col.5 lines 19-41 and col.7 lines 10-61).

As to claim 20, Delaney discloses that the data storage medium further stores instructions enabling the processor to associate the cached information with an identifier (any peer client knows both the unique identifier and the location of the data package on the local network, that client can then proceed to download the data package, see col.6 lines 13-65 and col.7 lines 10-39).

As to claim 21, Delaney discloses the data storage medium further stores instructions enabling the processor to associate the cached information with an identifier included with said data (each data package has a unique identifier and the location of the data package on the local network, see col.6 lines 13-65).

As to claim 24, Delaney discloses a method comprising:

setting up an on-line (through External network 18 fig.1A) meeting with a processor based system (20 fig.1A) using another processor-based system and receiving data from the one processor-based system (20 fig.1A) related to image to be displayed on other processor based system during the online meeting (sending queries to other peer clients to determine if any of them has a particular package and obtaining

Art Unit: 2151

the desired data package including images if available, see fig.1A, abstract, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19).

determining whether the image information is locally cached on other processor-based system before completing a download of the image information (if the neighboring client has the required package, the requesting client will download this data package rather than from the external server, see col.4 lines 38-61 and col.5 lines 19-41) and retrieving the previously cached information from the local cache if the image information was already locally cached [Peer Client transmitting the data package (cached data) from other Peer Client rather than server if the desired data package is available, see col.5 line 53 to col.6 line 43].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 8-11 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delaney in view of Maddalozzo, Jr. et al., U.S. Pat. No.5,878,218 (hereafter Maddalozzo).

As to claim 1, Delaney discloses an article comprising a medium storing instructions that enable a first processor-based system (Peer Client 20 of fig.1A) to:

set up an on-line meeting with a second processor-based system (Peer Client 22 of fig.1A) (Peer Client 20 connected to Peer Client 22 by an local network (14 fig.1A) using quires to determine if any peer client has a particular package, see fig.1A, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19).

receive image data from the second processor-based system (Peer Client 22 fig.1A), said image data to enable the display of an image transmitted from the second processor –based system (if the Peer Client 22 has the desired data package including image data, then peer client 20 obtain the data package from Peer Client 22, see fig.1B, col.1 lines 17-34 and col.5 lines 19-41).

retrieve the previously stored image information (checking if the desired data package stored in the local cache, see col.5 lines 19-37) if the information from the local cache coupled to said first processor-based system (Peer Client 20 of fig.1A) if the information was locally cached [Peer Client transmitting the data package (cached data) from other Peer Client if the desired data package is available, see col.5 line 53 to col.6 line 43].

Delaney does not specifically disclose upon receipt of the image data, utilize received image data to determine whether the information for the image is already stored in a local cache. However, Maddalozzo in the same network environment discloses upon receipt of the image data, utilize received image data to determine whether the information for the image is stored in a local cache (see abstract, fig.5C, col.11 line 42 to col.12 line 58). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Maddalozzo's teachings into the computer

Art Unit: 2151

system of Delaney to identify the common cache of the requested data file because it would have allowed users to access the most recent version of the requested data file that has been downloaded into a private network from a source external to the private network.

As to claim 2, Delaney discloses storing instructions that enable a first processor-based system to receive an image identifier [each data package (including documents, images, messages, data packages or other types of data, see col.1 lines 16-35) having a unique identifier MD5, see col.6 lines 12-43].

As to claim 3, Delaney discloses storing instructions that enable a first processor-based system to determine whether the image identifier identifies locally cached information (any peer client knows both the unique identifier and the location of the data package on the local network, that client can then proceed to download the data package, see col.6 lines 13-65 and col.7 lines 10-39).

As to claim 8, Delaney discloses storing instructions that enable a first processor-based system to complete the download of information from the second processor-based system if the image information is not locally cached (Client A downloading data package from Client B if the data package was not found in the local storage medium of Client A, see col.7 lines 10-61).

As to claim 9, Delaney discloses storing instructions that enable a first processor-based system to cache the downloaded information (using Peer Client A for downloading the data package to the local storage, see col.5 lines 19-41 and col.7 lines 10-61).

As to claim 10, Delaney discloses storing instructions that enable a first processor-based system to associate the cached information with an identifier information (any peer client knows both the unique identifier and the location of the data package on the local network, that client can then proceed to download the data package, see col.6 lines 13-65 and col.7 lines 10-39).

As to claim 11, Delaney discloses storing instructions that enables a first processor based system to associate the cached information with an identifier included with said data (each data package has an unique identifier and the location of the data package on the local network, see col.6 lines 13-65).

As to claim 22, Delaney an article comprising medium storing instructions that, if requested, enable a first processor-based system (22 fig.1A) to:

set up an on-line meeting with a second processor-based system (20 fig.1A),
send data to the second processor-based system (20 fig.1A) related to information on the first processor-based system [Peer Client 20 connected to Peer Client 22 by an local network (14 fig.1A) using quires to determine if any peer client has a particular

Art Unit: 2151

package and obtaining the desired data package if available, see fig.1A, col.1 lines 17-34 and col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19].

transmit the information on the first processor-based system to the second processor based system (20 fig.1A) if requested by the second processor-based system (if the Peer Client 22 has the desired data package, then peer client 20 obtain the data package from Peer Client 22, see fig.1B, col.5 lines 19-41).

Delaney does not specifically disclose transferring displayed information on a processor system to a remote processor. Maddalozzo in the same network environment discloses transferring displayed information on a processor system to a remote processor (in Fig.1, a personal computer 40A's user activating the "link" assume personal computer 40A specifies via a URL that the "web page" corresponding to the displayed "link" actually corresponds to a data file resident on computer 62, see fig.1, col.4 lines 15-52 and col.13 lines 5-27). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Maddalozzo's teachings into the computer system of Delaney to view an information request because it would have allowed users to view the requested data file that has been downloaded into a private network from a source external to the private network.

6. Claims 5-7, 16, 17, 23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Delaney and Maddalozzo and further in view of Pitts (Hereafter Pitts), U.S. Pat. No.6,205,475

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 5, although, Delaney does suggest instructions that enables a first processor based system (20 fig.1A) to determine a state of a second based system processor (22 fig.1A) (i.e., using quires to determine if any peer client has a particular package sending quires to other peer clients to determine if any of them has a particular package and obtaining the desired data package if available, see fig.1A, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19). Neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses flushing the cached information depending on a state of the second processor. However, Pitts in the same Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses instruction flushing the cached information depending on a state of a second processor (42 fig.1) [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to respond immediately to a request to access data from a client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation (42 fig.1) may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see figs.1, 8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

As to claim 6, although, Delaney does suggest transferring only needed data packages in a request message (see Delaney's col.11 lines 39-67). Neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses flushing the cached information and allowing images to be altered. However, Pitts in the same Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses flushing the cache information and allowing images to be altered [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to respond immediately to a request to access data from the client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see fig.8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

As to claim 7, although, Delaney does suggest instructions that enables a first processor based system (20 fig.1A) to send to the second processor (22 fig.1A) a request for information on the state of the second processor concerning its state (22 fig.1A) (i.e., using quires to determine if any peer client has a particular package

Art Unit: 2151

sending quires to other peer clients to determine if any of them has a particular package and obtaining the desired data package if available, see fig.1A, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19). Neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses flushing the cached information depending on a state of the second processor. However, Pitts in the same Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses instruction flushing the cached information depending on a state of a second processor (42 fig.1) [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to respond immediately to a request to access data from a client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation (42 fig.1) may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see figs.1, 8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

As to claim 16, although, Delaney does suggest instructions that enables the processor based system (20 fig.1A) to send to the second processor (22 fig.1A) a request for information on the state of the remote processor (22 fig.1A) (i.e., using quires to

determine if any peer client has a particular package sending quires to other peer clients to determine if any of them has a particular package and obtaining the desired data package if available, see fig.1A, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19). Neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses flushing the cached information depending on a state of the second processor. However, Pitts in the same Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses instruction flushing the cached information depending on a state of a second processor (42 fig.1) [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to respond immediately to a request to access data from a client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation (42 fig.1) may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see figs.1, 8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

As to claim 17, neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses specifically disclose flushing the cached information and allowing images to be altered. Although, Delaney does suggest transferring only needed data packages in a request message

(see Delaney's col.11 lines 39-67). Neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses flushing the cached information and allowing images to be altered. However, Pitts in the same Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses flushing the cache information and allowing images to be altered [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to respond immediately to a request to access data from the client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see fig.8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

As to claim 23, Delaney discloses storing instructions that enable a first processor-based system (22 fig.1A) to send data to the second processor-based system (20 fig.1A) concerning a state of the processor (i.e., using quires to determine if any peer client has a particular package sending quires to other peer clients to determine if any of them has a particular package and obtaining the desired data package if available, see fig.1A, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19). Neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically

Art Unit: 2151

discloses flushing the cached information depending on a state of the second processor. However, Pitts in the same Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses instruction flushing the cached information depending on a state of a second processor (42 fig.1) [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to respond immediately to a request to access data from a client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation (42 fig.1) may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see figs.1, 8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

As to claim 25, although Delaney suggests determining a state of the processor based system (22 fig.1A) (i.e., using quires to determine if any peer client has a particular package sending quires to other peer clients to determine if any of them has a particular package and obtaining the desired data package if available, see fig.1A, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19). Neither Delaney nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses flushing the cached information depending on a state of the processor. However, Pitts in the same

Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses instruction flushing the cached information depending on a state of a processor (42 fig.1) [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to respond immediately to a request to access data from a client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation (42 fig.1) may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see figs.1, 8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

As to claim 26, neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses does not specifically disclose flushing the cached information and allowing images to be altered. Although, Delaney does suggest transferring only needed data packages in a request message (see Delaney's col.11 lines 39-67). Neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses flushing the cached information and allowing images to be altered. However, Pitts in the same Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses flushing the cache information and allowing images to be altered [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used

recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to respond immediately to a request to access data from the client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see fig.8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

As to claim 27, although Delaney suggests determining a state of the processor based system (22 fig.1A) (i.e., using quires to determine if any peer client has a particular package sending quires to other peer clients to determine if any of them has a particular package and obtaining the desired data package if available, see fig.1A, col.4 line 66 to col.5 line 19). Neither Delany nor Maddalozzo specifically discloses flushing the cached information in response to data received from the processor system. However, Pitts in the same Client-Server monitoring network environment discloses flushing the cached information in response to data received from the processor system (42 fig.1) [i.e., using a CQ_SERVICE Channels (116 of fig.8) on the CQ_SERVICE list have been used recently, and are approaching the point where they will be unable to

respond immediately to a request to access data from a client workstation and containing an image of data that has been modified by the client workstation (42 fig.1) may contain dirty file data or metadata that needs to be flushed downstream toward the NDC server terminator site, see figs.1, 8, col.20 lines 7-57 and col.26 lines 4-47). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Pitts' teachings into the computer system of Delaney to monitor activities in a client computer's interface because it would have reduced delay data access times and maintained project images over an extended period of time so that requests by a client can be repeatedly serviced from the initial service of data (see Pitts' col.6 lines 24-49 and col.20 lines 36-57).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/23/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- Applicant asserts that the Delany reference does not disclose "the processor-based system receives data from the remote processor-based system related to information to be transmitted".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Taking claim 12 for example, Delany discloses a processor-based system as applicant claimed invention. Specifically, Delany clearly discloses the processor-based system (peer client 20 of fig.1A) receiving data (obtaining the data package) from the remote processor-based system (Peer Client 22 of fig.1A) related to information to be transmitted (see fig.1B,

col.5 lines 19-41). This is equivalent to what is claimed. Therefore, the claim is properly rejected.

- Applicant further asserts that “the Delany discloses the based processor queries the remote processor–based processor systems, which then response. But that response is not about information that the remote processor based system intends to distribute to the processor based system” and “someone who wants to transmit something to you lets you know what that thing is so that you can determine whether or not you need it”.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the Delany discloses the based processor queries the remote processor–based processor systems, which then response. But that response is not about information that the remote processor based system intends to distribute to the processor based system” and “someone who wants to transmit something to you lets you know what that thing is so that you can determine whether or not you need it) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

- Applicant asserts that the Delany reference does not disclose the new limitation such as "send data to the second processor-based system related to information already displayed on the first processor-based system".

Examiner respectfully points out that the combination of Delany and Maddalozzo discloses the applicant claimed invention. Specifically, Delany discloses transmitting the information on the first processor-based system to the second processor based system (20 fig.1A) if requested by the second processor-based system (if the Peer Client 22 has the desired data package, then peer client 20 obtain the data package from Peer Client 22, see fig.1B, col.5 lines 19-41). Delany does not specifically disclose transferring displayed information on a processor system to a remote processor. Maddalozzo in the same network environment discloses transferring displayed information on a processor system to a remote processor (in Fig.1, a personal computer 40A's user activating the "link" assume personal computer 40A specifies via a URL that the "web page" corresponding to the displayed "link" actually corresponds to a data file resident on computer 62, see fig.1, col.4 lines 15-52 and col.13 lines 5-27). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Maddalozzo's teachings into the computer system of Delaney to view an information request because it would have allowed users to view the requested data file that has been downloaded into a private network from a source external to the private network.

Therefore, the examiner asserts that cited prior art teaches or suggests the subject matter broadly recited in independent claims 1, 12, 22 and 24. Claims 2-3, 5-11, 13-21, 23, 25-27 are also rejected at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims and by other reasons set forth in the previous office action [mailed on 4/20/2005]. Accordingly, claims 1-3 and 5-27 are respectfully rejected.

Conclusion

8. Claims 1-3 and 5-27 are rejected.

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272

Art Unit: 2151

3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung, can be reached on (571) 272 3939. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Khanh Dinh
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2151
9/2/2005